



I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING DEPOSITED ON 7/25/06 WITH THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE AS FIRST CLASS MAIL IN AN ENVELOPE ADDRESSED TO: THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313-1450.

William Reeves  
(TYPED NAME OF PERSON MAILING PAPER OR FEE)

[Signature] 7/25/06  
(SIGNATURE OF PERSON MAILING PAPER OR FEE) DATE

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In the Application of: )  
)  
William F. Reeves ) Examiner: V. KOPPIKAR  
)  
for: COMPUTER INSTRUMENTS & EMERGENCY ) Group Art Unit: 3626  
MONITORING DEVICES FOR RETRIEVING )  
& DISPLAYING STORED MEDICAL )  
RECORDS FROM BODILY WORN ) fax 571-273-8300  
DEVICES )  
)  
Serial No.: 09/583,336 )  
)  
Filed on: May 31, 2000 )

Hamden, Connecticut, July 25, 2006

Mail Stop RCE  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION**

S I R:

Applicant hereby requests continued examination of the above identified application pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.114. This request is in response to the Final Office action dated May 4, 2006. The Applicant notes that he participated in a teleconference with the Examiners Supervisor, Joseph Thomas and Natalie Pass on 6/30/06. The Applicant has

received a brief summary of the teleconference dated 7/17/06 from the Examiner's office. Per the teleconference the Applicant pointed out that the Examiner is interpreting the prior art of Bisbee in such a way that the Examiner is concluding (in the final office action) that Bisbee (abstract and col 1 Ln 9-11) teaches one of the elements of the Applicant's Independent claims 58 and 68. The Applicant respectfully pointed out in the teleconference that Bisbee is not teaching an element of claims 58 and 68 and there is confusion on the Examiners part regarding the element of claim 58 "means of recognizing and authenticating said storage device via a unique digital identifier stored in said storage device when said storage device is ported to said computer devices." The Applicant pointed out that the storage device is hardware in the form of the bodily worn device described in his specification in the form of a bracelet, pendant and other hardware forms shown clearly in the drawings of this application. It is clear from reviewing Bisbee 5,615,268 that Bisbee teaches a authentication, storage and retrieval of digital documents, which he describes in detail and defines as electronic digital files or "software" so as to eliminate paper in commercial transactions. To further clarify and distinguish my art from Bisbee, and specifically this issue of hardware bodily worn storage devices (my art) from electronic digital document files (Bisbee), the Applicant has herein amended independent claims 58 and 68, and also amended the specification.

The Applicant respectfully points out to the Examiner the lengthy time this application has been under examination. Specifically, according to previous Examiner Kalinowski this application was "lost" within the USPTO for about 1.5 years. In addition it is respectfully pointed out that Petition to Expedite this examination was granted over 3

years ago and should still be in effect. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests an expedited reviewed of this RCE